

Date: Fri, 12 Nov 93 04:30:10 PST
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #445
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 12 Nov 93 Volume 93 : Issue 445

Today's Topics:

Bambi Meets Godzilla, or rec.radio.amateur.policy.on.the.air
THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Pleas

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 11 Nov 1993 17:36:14 GMT
From: library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!paladin.american.edu!afterlife!
blackbird.afit.af.mil!blackbird!jmillier@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Bambi Meets Godzilla, or rec.radio.amateur.policy.on.the.air
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Nov10.002837.10694@Csl.Stanford.EDU> paulf@Csl.Stanford.EDU
(Paul Flaherty) writes:

jeffj@cbnewsm.cb.att.com (jeffrey.n.jones) writes:

>>>I'm game. SSB or RTTY? :-) :-)
>> I'm game. CW or RTTY? :-) :-)
>Hey let's do it! 20 meters anyone?

Sure. How about 14.313 MHz?

Either that, or 28.325 MHz.

--

-Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Fighter pilots make movies. Bomber pilots make

->paulf@Stanford.EDU | history." -- Jake Grafton
^^^^^^

Nice quote. Is that from "Flight of the Intruder", "Final Flight", or the other book whose title I can't remember at the moment?

73, Jeff

--

Jeff Miller, NH6ZW/N8, AFA1HE (ex WD6CQV, AFA8JM, AFA1D0)
AFIT School of Engineering, Wright-Patterson AFB, OH. Help eliminate FOD.
Welcome to Ohio: Our state flower is the orange highway construction barrel.
55: It's not a good idea; it's just the law. E-mail me about the NMA.

Date: Thu, 11 Nov 1993 18:01:19 GMT
From: agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csl!paulf@ames.arpa
Subject: THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Pleas
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

dan@mystis.wariat.org (Dan Pickersgill N8PKV) writes:

>Some have said 40% of HF is CW, Accepted (without predjudice). Let's add
>hundreds of new "No-Code"'s with HF privileges. All these QSO's going
>on and 40% in CW. "There's that SSB station I can't quite hear and I want
>him for my WAS (or insert award of choice)". If CW is really all that
>great and NECESSARY to good HF practice, No-Codes will quickly decide it
>was worth their time after all and learn it. Or is it that CW isn't that
>great after all?

If what you say here is true, then the average ham will eventually use CW.
Since we test on what we want the average ham to know, given usage, then
we should test for CW.

Once again, if we extend this logic, why should we test people on theory if
they're just going to operate appliances? Why do they need to know the VE
rules if they're never going to VE? Who cares about the 80m band edges if
you're not going to operate there?

The reason that we DON'T test this way is so that everyone has a common pool
of skills, something that's useful both in normal times, and vital in an
emergency. Instead, we test for knowledge that we want the AVERAGE amateur
in that class to demonstrate.

--

-=>Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Fighter pilots make movies. Bomber pilots make
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | history." -- Jake Grafton

Date: Tue, 9 Nov 1993 19:31:17 +0000
From: swrinde!gatech!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!doc.ic.ac.uk!uknet!demon!
llondel.demon.co.uk!dave@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Nov4.032744.16866@mixcom.mixcom.com>,
<CFzI04.IFA@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <CG6p8z.5AC@sugar.NeoSoft.COM>
Reply-To : dave@llondel.demon.co.uk
Subject : Re: This is a hobby not a career (was: 3rd party Flame for R

In article <CG6p8z.5AC@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> gclarkii@NeoSoft.com (Gary Clark II)
writes:

>Jeff,

>

>Do you blow your own tubes???

>

Do you mean as in blow the glass to make them, or blow them as in wreck them?

I am sure many amateurs have managed the latter :-)

Dave

--

* G4WRW @ GB7WRW.#41.GBR.EU AX25 * Start at the beginning. Go on *
* dave@llondel.demon.co.uk Internet * until the end. Then stop. *
* g4wrv@g4wrv.ampr.org Ampnet * (the king to the white rabbit) *

Date: 12 Nov 93 09:12:55 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!news.moneng.mei.com!howland.reston.ans.net!noc.near.net!
news.delphi.com!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CGAM4o.Jvw@cbnewsm.cb.att.com>, <931110.70545.EDELLERS@delphi.com>,
<1993Nov11.183105.11133@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>
Subject : Re: THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Pleas

"...but how many hams who currently use and enjoy CW operation would do so if
they were not required to learn it?"

Almost all of them. You can't force someone to like something.

Date: Thu, 11 Nov 1993 18:23:11 GMT
From: agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csl!paulf@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Nov8.200054.9274@TorreyPinesCA.ncr.com>,
<DNLqcc2w165w@amanda.jpunix.com>, <1993Nov11.052652.26837@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: Dealing with Internet Jammers

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>Of course most hams are appliance operators, most drivers are
>too, but all commercial operators are appliance operators, they're
>required to use type accepted equipment. That proves nothing. The
>amateur license does mean something. It means the FCC has granted
>the licensee authority to operate in the Amateur Radio Service.
>That's all it means, and all it should mean. [...]

A GMRS license grants authority to operate in the Citizen's Radio Service.
That's all it means. No exam is required to obtain a GMRS license. So,
by extension, no exam should be required for an Amateur License. If all the
license is ONLY supposed to be is an operation authorization, as you say, then
why have any examination at all?

Either this view of the Amateur license is false, or you've just advocated
removal of license testing.

--

--Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Fighter pilots make movies. Bomber pilots make
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | history." -- Jake Grafton

Date: Thu, 11 Nov 1993 18:13:44 GMT
From: agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csl!paulf@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Nov10.102158.23319@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<1993Nov10.184700.13232@Csl.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993Nov11.043039.26340@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>
Subject : Re: THE argument for CW requirements (was: End-It All Now, Pleas

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>>The relevent question is "what do we want the average ham (in this class)
>>to know?" Clearly that question is answered by utilization. Since the
>>average ham does use CW on HF, then it should be tested for. On the other
>>hand, it shouldn't be tested for on the VHF+ bands, since it's seldom used.

>The average ham also uses voice on HF, but we don't have a separate
>test for that.

The exam assumes knowledge based on other performances. We assume, for
example, that proof of receiving ability is in turn proof of sending
ability. It also assumes that, given the ability to read an exam written
in English, that one can speak English.

>Many hams use SSTV on HF, but we don't have a separate
>test on how to focus a camera.

Bogon. Less than 1% of all amateurs use SSTV on HF. 1% clearly is **not**
many. This mode pretty clearly fails the average usage test.

> Many hams run packet on HF, but we don't
>have a separate test on that.

No, "many" hams do not run packet on HF (and thank goodness for it). Again,
10% is not "many" by anyone's definition.

>Instead we figure that the average ham
>will **learn** what he needs to know to operate his chosen mode. No
>special test is needed unless we are trying to **recruit** people to
>a particular mode via government coercion.

Okay, if someone is going to learn everything on their own, why test for
anything? Look, if you're going to attack my view of what and why we
test for, that's all fine and good, but again you still have yet to
demonstrate an **alternative** testing philosophy. In absence, you're advocating
abolishing testing, by omission.

--

-="Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Fighter pilots make movies. Bomber pilots make
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | history." -- Jake Grafton

Date: Thu, 11 Nov 1993 18:39:31 GMT
From: agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!Csl!paulf@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <rcrw90-101193100706@node_142cf.aieg.mot.com>,
<1993Nov10.224353.21654@Csl.i.Stanford.EDU>, <CGC2yB.9D1@walter.bellcore.com>
Subject : Re: This is a hobby not a career (was: 3rd

whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com (sohl,william h) writes:

>The logic presented here can not go unchallenged. Yes, by only answering
>7 questions correct you are only proving you copied (or guessed correctly)
>7 of the words that were sent, but no one knows which 7 words will
>be the ones that provide the correct answer AND, very often the question
>requires knowing an entire series of words in order to recognize that
>an individual word is the correct answer to a specific question. For
>example: If a question asks "Who is going to Dayton?" You would
>need to copy most of the following (as part of the CW test) in order
>to get the correct answer. "Next April John is going the Dayton."
>Merely having John as a single word may get you a lucky guess, but the
>CW test usually has several different names in it with different
>qualities or aspects associated with each name mentioned.

You're assuming that no information is obtained from incorrect words, which
is clearly false. I may have copied April as "urpml" but from the question
text I know I'm looking for a month with five letters preceeding a name,
and "urpml" looks a lot more like April than March. And again, this is from
a good distractor. The written, which in theory is professionally designed,
has terrible distractors. Given that the CW exams are seldom given by
professional educators, you expect the distractors to be any better?

You're also neglecting the fact that people tend to copy in spurts, until
their short term cache overflows. All I need to pass are seven good spurts,
and since I can take the exam as MANY times as I wish, the probability of
that occurring is quite high.

In any event, nearly everyone acknowledges that the written exam is too easy.
Rather than making the CW exam easier (and thus similar in weight, by your
interpretation), why not make the written exam harder?

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "Fighter pilots make movies. Bomber pilots make
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | history." -- Jake Grafton

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #445

